



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,720	07/21/2003	Kristopher L. Tyra	480/US/2	7558
59555	7590	11/21/2007		
RATHE PATENT & IP LAW 10611 W. HAWTHORNE FARMS LANE MEQUON, WI 53097			EXAMINER SAEED, USMAAN	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/624,720		TYRA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Usmaan Saeed		2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Receipt of Applicant's Amendment, filed 09/10/2007 is acknowledged.

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 6-41 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to an environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Software or program can be stored on a medium and/or executed by a computer. In other words software must be a computer readable. The software is not claimed as being embodied in computer-readable storage media. The claim recites "software or hardware embodying computer readable instructions." Software embodying computer readable instructions is still program per se. See MPEP § 2106.IV.B.1 (a).

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of application amending these claims to place them within the four categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Blott et al.** (**Blott** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,618) in view of **Pohlmann et al.** (**Pohlmann** hereinafter) (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,926).

With respect to claim 1, **Blott** teaches **an apparatus comprising software or hardware embodying computer readable instructions for performing operations on data within a network, comprising:**

“a receive module associated with an entry for receiving from a machine in the network a request to be performed on particular data content” as the real-time EPS 12 processes events on behalf of the real-time component 16, which may be, e.g., a network switch, a service control point (SCP) or other element of a communication system or network, and maintains summary and aggregation data over those events (Blott Col 3, Lines 26-30). The term "event" as used herein is intended to include any type of transaction involving contents of a database system, such as, for example, a group of read, update, delete and/or modify operations (Blott Col 3, Lines 44-47).

“a store module for locally storing, associated with the machine, information related to the request” as the events are processed in accordance with services implemented in the RAEs, and utilize data stored in a memory portion of the main-memory database system accessible to the RAEs. The data may include, e.g., a subscription table storing subscription information indicating the service or services that should be executed for a given event (Blott Abstract).

“a transmit module, associated with the entity, for implementing and for communicating the results to subscribers referencing the machine” as a main-memory database system is coupled to the RAEs, and the RAEs process events associated with input streams from one or more data sources and deliver output streams to one or more data sinks. The data source and data sinks may be, e.g., network elements, clients, databases, etc (Blott Abstract Col 2, Lines 6-27 and figure 2).

Blott teaches the elements of claim 1 as noted above but does not explicitly disclose “**comparison on the data content.**”

However, **Pohlmann** teaches “**comparison on the data content**” as specification of various forms of comparison that can be specified for each of the fields of an event including key value pairs of the extended event structure (**Pohlmann** Col 5, Lines 65-67). The fundamental subexpression of an event filter is, for example, a phrase comparing a field of an event with a value, e.g., node=ptisun20 (**Pohlmann** Col 6, Lines 5-7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of the cited references because **Pohlmann's** teaching would have allowed **Blott** to provide an integrated system for routing events occurring in point products through a common event management system, dynamic filtering of events across nodes of an enterprise, and routing a subscription request defined by an event filter.

With respect to claim 2, **Blott** teaches “**the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the receive module includes a module for receiving an identification of the machine**” as other examples of data sources or data sinks include the examples of the real-time component 16 and EPS 12 given previously, e.g., computers or other types of digital data processors (**Blott** Col 5, Lines 1-3).

With respect to claim 3, **Blott** teaches “**the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the receive module includes a module for transmitting a data cell including the request**” as (**Blott** figure 2).

With respect to claim 4, **Blott** teaches “**the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the transmit module includes a module for transmitting a data cell including the event**” as a main-memory database system is coupled to the RAEs, and the RAEs process events associated with input streams from one or more data sources and deliver output streams to one or more data sinks. The data source and data sinks may be, e.g., network elements, clients, databases, etc (**Blott** Abstract Col 2, Lines 6-27 and figure 2). A view over an output stream aggregates summary information over all the events processed by the system. Frequently, chronicles represent either query results, or processed-event records that are delivered to a data warehouse for archiving (**Blott** Col 12, Lines 15-19).

With respect to claim 5, **Blott** teaches “**the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the receive module includes a module for receiving an add, update, delete, or find operation**” as the term "event" as used herein is intended to include any type of transaction involving contents of a database system, such as, for example, a group of read, update, delete and/or modify operations (**Blott** Col 3, Lines 44-47).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In these arguments applicant relies on amended claims and not the original ones.

See above rejections for response to the arguments.

Claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation during examination and limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim (See M.P.E.P. 2111 [R-I]).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Usmaan Saeed whose telephone number is (571)272-4046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (571)272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Usmaan Saeed
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2166



Hosain Alam
Supervisory Patent Examiner

US
November 1, 2007